DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 999 UD 021 072

TITLE	The Impact of Title I Students' Background and Behavior on Educational and Affective Development, 1978-79. Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.
INSTITUTION	NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	May 80
CONTRACT	0487-AA-NS-N-9-GA
NOTE	76p.: For related documents see UD 021 076-078. Appendix may be marginally legible due to small print.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; *Emotional Development; Program Evaluation; *Self Concept; Self Concept Measures; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The goals of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I program operated by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia were to provide disadvantaged children with supplemental instructional services to improve their performance in reading and mathematics and to support their affective and psychomotor development. This volume of the four-part evaluation of the 1978-79 program reports the status of student self-concept development as assessed through administration of the student-completed Self-Observation Scales. The relation of self-concept to achievement is described. In addition, teacher perceptions of student behavior, attitudes, and characteristics are reported. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OCT 2 4 1980

ED196999

EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Impact of Title I Students' Background and Behavior on Educational and Affective Development

1978-79

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Cooper
D.C. Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted to:
Division of Research and Evaluation
The Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.
Under Contract No. 0487-AA-NS-N-9-GA

Prepared by: **NTS Research Corporation**

UD021072

EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE IMPACT OF TITLE I STUDENTS' BACKGROUND AND BEHAVIOR ON EDUCATIONAL AND AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

1978 - 79

Submitted to:

Division of Research and Evaluation
The Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Under Contract No. 0487-AA-BS-9-GA

Prepared by NTS Research Corporation

OCT 2 0 1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their generous contributions of time and energy to the 1978-79 evaluation effort, we wish to express our gratitude to the following persons:

Mrs. Anne W. Pitts
Executive Director of the Title I Program;

Dr. Judine Johnson
Deputy Director of the Title I Program;

Dr. Mildred Cooper
Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Mrs. June Bland
Assistant for Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Mr. Earl L. Hunter
Director of Title I Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Dr. Phillis Hobson, Coordinator
Title I Parkent Involvement Component.

We should also like to thank the Title I principals, program coordinators, teachers, aides, nonteaching professionals, and parents, who assisted with a number of important activities associated with the evaluation. Other persons whose assistance was invaluable included NTS Region III Technical Assistance Center staff, Dr. Joan B. Troy, and Dr. Joseph Haenn; as well as evaluation project staff (Daniel Johnston and B. Steven Davis).

Becky Jon Hayward, Ph.D.
Janice Mahony
Rebecca Posante-Loro

May 1980

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

INTRODUCTION 1

Overview of the Title I Program 1

Program Selection Process 3
Program Objectives and Expected Outcomes 3
Program Services 5

DESIGN 9

The Primary Level 11
The Junior High Level 13
Description of the Student Population 16

PROFILE OF THE TITLE I CHILD 18

The Students 18
Types of Title I Services Received 21

Factors Affecting Title I Students' Educational Progress 27

Barriers to Educational Progress 27
Parental Support 27
School Experience 34
Summary of the Characteristics of the Title I Student Population 37

AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF TITLE I STUDENTS 38

Introduction 38
Sample 38
Scale Scores for Title I Students 39
SOS Scale Scores Related to Teacher-Rated Student Strengths 40
Summary 43

TEACHER RATINGS OF AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF REPEATING AND NONREPEATING STUDENTS 47

Children Receiving Math Lab Services 49
Children Receiving Reading Lab Services 54
Math and Reading Lab Summary 60

AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF REPEATING AND NONREPEATING STUDENTS REPORTED BY THE STUDENTS 61

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 63

REFERENCES 64

APPENDIX A 66

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number of Students Receiving Title I Supplementary Instructional Services by Grade (1978-79)	2
2	Title I Students For Whom SIF and SOS Data are Available (1978-79)	17
3	Title I Students with Completed SIFs in 1978-79 by Grade Level	18
4	Sex of the Title I Child by Grade Level (1978-79) (in percent)	19
5	Percentage of Students Repeating a Grade (1978-79)	19
6	Teachers' Perceptions of Title I Students' Need for Services (1978-79) (in percent)	20
7	Number of Weeks Title I Services Were Received (1978-79) (in percent)	21
8	Percentage of Title I Children Receiving Lab Services (1978-79)	22
9	Number of Hours Per Week of Reading Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in percent)	23
10	Number of Weeks of Reading Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in percent)	23
11	Number of Hours Per Week of Math Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in percent)	24
12	Number of Weeks of Math Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in percent)	24
13	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Grade (1978-79)	25
14	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Number of Days Per Week (1978-79)	25
15	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Number of Weeks Per Year (1978-79)	26
16	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Supportive Services by Grade Level (1978-79)	26
17	Type of Supportive Services Being Received by Title I Students by Grade Levels (1978-79)	27
18	Percentage of Students with Economic Need (1978-79)	28
19	Percentage of Students Demonstrating Aggressive Behavior	29

List of Tables (cont'd.)

20	Percentage of Title I Students with Physical or Health Problems	30
21	Percentage of Title I Students Who Have Physical or Health Problems Who are Being Treated (1978-79)	30
22	Percentage of Title I Students Evidencing A Communication Problem (1978-79)	31
23	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Parental Support (1978-79)	32
24	Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Various Types of Family Support by Grade (1978-79)	33
25	Degree to Which Title I Students' Background Affects Functioning in the Classroom (1978-79) (in percent)	34
26	Percentage of Title I Students with Preschool Experience by Grade Level (1978-79)	35
27	Percentage of Students Enrolled in the Same Classroom Throughout 1978-79 School Year	36
28	Title I Student Absenteeism by Grade (1978-79)(in percent)	37
29	Sample Distribution of the Students Responding to the Self Observation Scales (SOS) (1978-79)	38
30	Mean NCE Scores of Title I Students Across Self-Concept Subscores (1978-79)	40
31	Self Acceptance Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (1978-79) (in NCEs)	41
32	Social Maturity Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)	42
33	School Affiliation Scale for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)	44
34	Self Security Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)	45
35	Number of Repeaters and Nonrepeaters who Received Math Lab Services for Whom SOS Data are Available (1979-79)	49
36	Ratings of Math Lab Students' Characteristics for First Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	50
37	High (4 & 5) and Low (1 & 2) Scores for Self Confidence for Repeaters Past, Present and Past and Present (1978-79) (in percent)	51

List of Tables (cont'd.)

38	Ratings of Student Characteristics for Second Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	51
39	Ratings of Student Characteristics for Third Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	52
40	High and Low Extreme Rankings for the Characteristics Across Grades 1, 2 and 3 (1978-79) (in percent)	53
41	Present, Past and Present/Past Repeaters: Percentage of Students Ranked High and Low (1978-79)	54
42	Number of Repeaters and Nonrepeaters Receiving Reading Lab Services by Grade (1978-79)	55
43	Ratings of Reading Lab Student Characteristics for First Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	56
44	Low Scores (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in percent)	56
45	Ratings of Reading Lab Students' Characteristics for Second Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	57
46	Low Scores (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in percent)	58
47	Ratings of Reading Lab Student Characteristics for Third Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in percent)	59
48	Low Score (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in percent)	59
49	Mean SOS Scores for Repeating and Nonrepeating Title I Students (in NCEs)	61

INTRODUCTION

An evaluation of the 1978-79 ESEA Title I Program operated in the District of Columbia Public Schools was conducted by NTS Research Corporation under contract to the Division of Research and Evaluation, District of Columbia Public Schools. The results of this evaluation are presented in a series of reports.[1] The current document, Evaluation of the Impact of Title I Students' Background and Behavior on Educational and Affective Development, reports the status of student self-concept development as assessed through administration of a student-completed instrument. The relation of self-concept to achievement is described. Additionally, teacher perceptions of student behavior, attitudes, and characteristics are reported.

Overview of the Title I Program

The central goal of the ESEA Title I Program operated by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia is to provide disadvantaged children with supplementary instructional services which will enable them to improve their performance in reading and mathematics. Additionally, student affective and psychomotor development is emphasized as an important program goal. For academic year 1978-79, the program had a budget of approximately $14.6 million to provide

[1] Other reports in the series are Evaluation of Program Impact on Reading and Mathematics Achievement, Evaluation of the Title I Instructional Process and Support Components, and Executive Summary.

supplementary instructional and support services to almost 15,000 Title I eligible students in 89 public and private elementary and junior high schools.[2] Students in grades kindergarten, one, two, three and seven were eligible to receive services. Additionally, a pilot fourth grade reading program was operated in selected schools.

Table 1 indicates the distribution by grade of students who received Title I services during the 1978-79 school year. As these data indicate, a total of almost 15,000 students received supplementary instruction in reading, mathematics, or reading and mathematics during the 1978-79 school year.

Table 1

Number of Students Receiving Title I Supplementary Instructional Services[a] by Grade (1978-79)
(Unduplicated)

Grade	Number of Students Served
K	2,845
1	3,172
2	2,697
3	3,147
4	902
7	2,091
Total	14,854

[a]For kindergarten, the number of students served included kindergarten students served by Title I aides and classroom teachers. For grades one, two, three, and seven, the number served is the total number of students who received laboratory instruction in reading or mathematics during the 1978-79 school year. Fourth graders received reading instruction only.

Source: Service data provided by Title I program office.

[2]A pilot program was planned for high schools but was not implemented in 1978-79. Appendix A includes a listing of Title I schools for 1978-79.

Program Selection Process

Selection of students for participation in the 1978-79 Title I program was based on two factors: residence in an eligible school attendance area and educational deprivation. School area eligibility was determined through use of a formula which weights the number of children from low-income families residing within the assigned school boundary as indicated by 1970 census data (40 percent) and the number of children eligible for free lunches in the year of selection (60 percent). Thus, eligible schools were determined on the basis of relative level of poverty in the area and on numbers of children affected by conditions of poverty.

For students residing in Title I school attendance areas, several factors were used to determine educational deprivation, including:

- scores at or below the fortieth percentile on the reading or mathematics section of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) administered in the previous spring;
- over age for grade; and
- repeat of a grade.[3]

Additionally, students could be recommended for Title I services by their teachers or principals if they had transferred into the school attendance area and for this or some other reason did not have achievement test scores, or if their classroom performance was substantially lower than their test scores predicted. In such cases, documentation was required to support the selection.

Program Objectives and Expected Outcomes

Objectives. As indicated previously, the major goal of the 1978-79 program was to improve the academic, psychomotor, and effective performance and behavior of Title I students. To facilitate achievement of this goal, a number of student-

[3]Students who have repeated or are over age for grade are eligible for Title I services regardless of their achievement test scores.

related objectives were delineated. Objectives in each of the four major areas of program focus (reading achievement, mathematics achievement, psychomotor skills, and affective behavior) included the following:

> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will achieve a mean gain of ten months in reading, as measured by standardized achievement tests.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will achieve a mean gain of ten months in mathematics, as measured by standardized achievement tests.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will demonstrate a positive change in affective behaviors, as reported by measures of affective growth.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will demonstrate growth in psychomotor development, as indicated by measures of psychomotor growth.[4]

Expected outcomes. For each of the program objectives focusing on academic performance, a set of expected student outcomes was articulated. For reading, these outcomes included the following:

- an increase in the quantity and quality of student verbal interaction, as measured by informal tests and adult-student observations;
- an increase in student listening comprehension skills, as indicated by measures of listening comprehension;
- an increase in student listening, speaking, reading, and writing vocabularies, as measured by informal and standardized measures and tests;
- an increase in student ability to attack new words, as measured by individual reading inventories;
- an increase in student reading comprehension, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in the quality and quantity of books read by students, as measured by records maintained by teachers and students; and

[4]Source: ESEA Title I Comprehensive Program Description for FY 1979, Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

- an increase in the quantity and quality of student written language expression, as measured by a comparative record maintained by teachers and students.

Expected student outcomes in mathematics included:

- an increase in student understanding of the language of mathematics, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student understanding and verbalization of the concepts of mathematics, as measured by observation and informal standardized tests;
- an increase in student computational skills, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student problem-solving abilities, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student ability and opportunity to apply mathematical skills to practical life experiences, as indicated by adult-student observations; and
- an increase in student interest in and appreciation for mathematics, as measured by adult-student observations and attitude scales.

Finally, the program identified a series of affective outcomes which could be expected of students participating in the 1978-79 Title I program. These included:

- a positive self-concept, as indicated by measures of affective growth;
- a positive interest in and attitude toward the school curriculum, as indicated by measures of affective growth;
- positive peer relationships among students, as indicated by measures of affective growth; and
- positive relationships between students and adults, as indicated by measures of affective growth.

Program Services

Two major types of services were provided by the 1978-79 Title I program to facilitate achievement of program objectives and outcomes. The major service offered was supplementary instruction in reading and mathematics. Additionally, a number of support and optional services were available to Title I participants.

A brief description of these services is presented in this section.

Supplementary instructional services. At the elementary level (grades one, two, and three)[5], the Title I supplementary instructional program includes three components, or interventions: the laboratory program, the tutorial program, and the classroom program. For seventh graders, instructional services include the laboratory and tutorial programs.

The laboratory program provides participants with 45 minutes in elementary and 55 minutes in junior high school of reading or mathematics instruction daily in a laboratory setting for a full school year. In elementary schools, laboratories are staffed by a team consisting of a Title I teacher, educational aide, and program assistant. In general, Title I junior high schools have two teachers and two educational aides to provide laboratory instruction. In both elementary and junior high schools, the lab program is the major component of the Title I supplementary instructional services.

The second major component of Title I instructional services at both the elementary and junior high school levels is the tutorial program. This component provides additional reading or mathematics instruction to laboratory participants who have been recommended by their lab teacher and have parental permission to attend. The tutorial program operates either before or after school on Monday through Thursday and is staffed by educational aides.

The third component of Title I instructional services is the classroom program. This component provides special instruction in reading and mathematics to Title I students in kindergarten through grade three. Instruction is provided in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher for one and one-half hours per week. Additionally, Title I program assistants, parent-partners, and, in kindergarten, kindergarten aides serve as staff members for

[5]The Title I fourth grade program provided reading laboratory only.

the classroom component.

Support services. In addition to instructional services, a number of supportive services designed to facilitate achievement of program objectives were provided by the 1978-79 Title I program. These services fall into two categories: base and optional services. Base services included the following:

- parent volunteer services;
- program assistant services; and
- clothing, shoes, glasses, and hearing aides.

Optional services provided Title I elementary students included the following:

- pupil personnel team services;
- kindergarten aide services;
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services; and
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services.[6]

Base support services were provided to all Title I elementary schools, while optional services were arranged to comprise four option packages, each including three of the four service options. Each school was provided a package of optional services in addition to the base services available to all Title I children.

A lottery system was utilized to allocate optional Title I services packages to elementary schools during the 1978-79 school year. The four packages included the following services:

Package A

- pupil personnel team services
- kindergarten aide services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services

[6]Parent partner services and cultural enrichment comprised a single optional service, as did staff development and regional resource teacher services.

Package B

- pupil personnel team services
- kindergarten aide services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

Package C

- kindergarten aide services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

Package D

- pupil personnel team services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

A total of 16 schools each were provided Package A services, Package B services and Package D services, while 17 schools were provided Package C services.

While the full evaluation of the 1978-79 Title I program includes assessment of the student's progress in all areas of program service,[7] the focus of this report is on the Title I students' educational and affective development.

In order to assess their affective development, as well as the impact of various demographic and environmental factors on their educational progress, students in Title I classrooms were asked to complete a self-concept measurement instrument, and their teachers were requested to complete an instrument designed to collect demographic, environmental, and behavioral information. Analyses of results from the Self Observation Scales (SOS) and of data collected on the Student Information Form (SIF) are presented in this report. Subsequent sections include a description of the evaluation design, instruments, and student population; a presentation of the analyses; and a discussion of the findings.

[7] Evaluations of various program components, including the impact of Title I instructional services on student achievement in reading and mathematics, are presented in separate reports.

DESIGN

Among the areas to be examined in the evaluation of the 1978-79 Title I program were questions concerning the extent to which environmental and demographic factors have impact on Title I students' educational development as indicated by teacher judgment, and a profile of the educational and affective characteristics of Title I students. Specific questions addressed in this phase of the evaluation included the following:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses in self-concept profiles of Title I students?
2. How do Title I students' self-concepts vary with age and grade?
3. What is the relationship between Title I students' self-concepts and their teachers' perceptions of their affective development?
4. How do Title I students' characteristics compare for students who are repeaters and students who have never repeated a grade?
5. How do Title I students who are repeaters compare in affective development to those who have never repeated a grade?

Data necessary to answer these questions were collected on the Student Information Form (SIF) and the Self-Observation Scales (SOS).

Student Information Form (SIF). The SIF was developed to collect information from teachers about individual students concerning their background, home environment, and other nonacademic and demographic factors. School-related information collected on the SIF includes grade levels and grades repeated, Title I eligibility and participation, absence history, health status, and language communications problems. Other information collected includes sex, behavioral patterns (withdrawn behavior, aggressiveness, etc.), and level of family support manifested.

The SIF for 1978-79 was designed in a series of meetings held in early spring 1979. The design committee included staff from the Division of Research and Evaluation, members of the Title I staff, and teachers and principals from Title I schools. Student information forms used in previous years were reviewed, and uses of various data items were analyzed. The form developed during this design effort is presented in Appendix A.

In an attempt to improve the accuracy of forms completed and thus the matches between the SIF and CTBS fall and spring achievement tests, all SIFs for students who took the fall CTBS were premarked with student name and identification number. Sets of forms were distributed to individual teachers in whose classrooms students were enrolled in fall 1978. Additionally, a forms completion handbook was developed which provided information on procedures to be followed with students who had enrolled in particular classrooms following the fall administration of the CTBS.

The overall objective of this new procedure was to increase the number of students available for the achievement analysis required for evaluation of the Title I program. As data presented in Table 2 show, this objective was only partially attained. Match rates improved over the previous year for students in grades one, two, and three.

Self-Observation Scales (SOS). The Self-Observation Scales (SOS) used in the 1978-79 evaluation is a direct, self-report, group-administered, nationally normed, and standardized instrument with empirically determined scales which measure the way students perceive themselves and their relationships with peers, teachers, and school.

The SOS was developed to measure dimensions of children's affective behavior. Four dimensions (self-acceptance, social maturity, school affiliation, and self-security) at the primary level and seven dimensions (self-acceptance, self-security, social confidence, self-assertion, peer affiliation, teacher affiliation,

and school affiliation) at the junior high level have been useful in predicting aspects of children's affective development. Some of these are well known; for example, self-security (the inverse of anxiety) has been the focus of research for a number of years, and school, teacher, and peer affiliations represent constructs long used by educators in describing children. However, social maturity and social confidence are somewhat innovative dimensions which have not received much attention in self-concept research.

The Primary Level

The primary level of the SOS (Form C) was designed for grades 1-3. Each of four scales at the primary level represents a positive quality, with high scores being most indicative of the characteristic of the label. Below are descriptions of each scale.

Scale I. Self-Acceptance

Children with high scores view themselves positively and attribute to themselves the qualities of happiness, importance, and general competence. They see themselves as important to other people, including authority figures and peers. Children with low scores view themselves as inadequate, unsuccessful, unhappy, and as undesirable and unimportant to others. Three items on the Self Acceptance scale reflect values:

- Do other children in the class think you are a good worker?
- Are you good-looking?
- Do you feel good about yourself most of the time?

The children's answers to the questions reveal how highly they value themselves in school and elsewhere.

Scale II. Social Maturity

Children with high scores view their relationships and interactions with other people (especially peers) positively. They view themselves as independent, persistent, and sensitive to the needs and feelings of others. Children with low scores view themselves as quitters and loners, they see themselves as wanting to dominate in peer situations, but they actually prefer to be alone. Three items highly descriptive of the Social Maturity scale are:

- Do you like to play only when you are the leader?
- Do you always want to be first in line?
- Do other children do things better than you?

Answers to these questions may indicate confidence (high score) or a lack of it (low score) in social interactions.

Scale III. School Affiliation

Children with high scores view school as a positive influence in their lives. They enjoy going to school, and they enjoy school activities. Children with low scores view school as an unhappy unimportant place, and they do not enjoy most school activities. Three items highly descriptive of the School Affiliation scale are:

- Do you like to come to school every day?
- Is school a happy place?
- Do you like to stay home from school?

Answers to these questions show how well the children have adjusted to school.

Scale IV. Self Security

Children with high scores have low levels of anxiety and high levels of emotional stability. They view themselves as being in harmony with people, and they are confident about new experiences and their abilities to perform adequately. Low-scoring children report being anxious, depressed, and unsure of themselves;

furthermore, new experiences tend to be anxiety provoking because of the children's uncertainties about their abilities to perform. Three items highly descriptive of the Self Security scale are:

- Do you get nervous at school?
- Do you feel lonely very often?
- Do you worry about a lot of things?

Reports of the absence or presence of nervousness, loneliness, and worry are indicative of adjustments to routine and new experiences in and out of school.

The Junior High Level

The junior high level of the SOS (Form C) was designed for grades 7-9. Form C has 72 items measuring seven dimensions of student affective behavior. Each scale is labeled in a positive manner with high scores being most characteristic of the label.

Scale I. Self Acceptance

Students with high scores view themselves positively and attribute to themselves qualities of basic competence, self-satisfaction, and happiness. They see themselves as performing well in many activities and as possessing confidence in their future successes. Students with low scores are unsatisfied with their performances and abilities, and they are unsure of their future. Three items highly related to this Self Acceptance scale are:

- I do a lot of things well.
- I think I will be successful in life.
- When I look in the mirror I like what I see.

The present and the future are inherent in the values that junior high school students have for themselves.

Scale II. Self Security

Students with high scores report high levels of emotional confidence or stability -- being in control of factors affecting their lives and worrying little about specific or nonspecific fears. Students with low scores report nervousness about nonspecific performance expectations, and they often worry a great deal, more now than in the past. Three items highly related to this Self Security scale are:

- I often find myself worrying about something.
- At times I lose sleep over worry.
- I worry about losing my friends.

Self-satisfaction with performance, friendships, and other factors is important for junior high children to feel secure and free of worry.

Scale III. Social Confidence

Students with high scores express confidence in their abilities to relate in social situations and to make and keep friends, and they believe that other people value their friendships. Students with low scores have difficulty making friends and lack confidence in social situations. Three items highly related to Social Confidence scale are:

- People who are like me don't have a good chance to be successful.
- Most of my friends don't care what I think.
- If people knew what I am really like, they would steer clear of me.

Confidence in being socially acceptable and successful are revealed by what these students think they are or what others think they are.

Scale IV. Self Assertion

Students with high scores view themselves as possessing leadership qualities and as being respected by others for having these qualities. Students with low

scores see themselves as lacking leadership ability and assertiveness. Three items related to this Self Assertion scale are:

- Other students look to me for leadership.
- Other students look to me for ideas.
- In discussion with my friends, my point of view usually wins.

Here, the emphasis is on how the students believe other people view them; that is, being accepted and depended on by others can promote assertiveness.

Scale V. Peer Affiliation

Students with high scores consider their relationships with other students to be both of high quality and of considerable importance. They see themselves as approved of and valued by their peers, and they like to be with other students. Students with low scores do not see their peer relationships as an asset. They view other students as unfriendly, and do not accept the responsibilities of friendship easily; thus they have few friends. Three items highly related to this Peer Affiliation scale are:

- I make friends easily.
- Other students are usually fair to me.
- I can count on my friends when I am in trouble.

Abilities to make and keep a number of friends are indications of both the importance and the responsibilities of social interactions.

Scale VI. Teacher Affiliation

Students with high scores like their teachers, and they see them as helpful, attentive, understanding, and generous. Students with low scores see the teachers as arbitrary and inconsiderate of children and as sources of emotional pain. Three items related to this Teacher Affiliation scale are:

- My teachers like to help me.

- When I do something wrong, my teachers correct me without hurting my feelings.
- My teachers expect too much of me.

Abilities to accept and interact with authority figures during various demands on performances in school are revealed by these scores.

Scale VII. School Affiliation

Students with high scores view school positively, enjoy going to school, and enjoy the school activities. Students scoring low, see school as a "hassle" that keeps them from doing what they want to do. Three items highly related to this School Affiliation scale are:

- I like to stay home from school.
- This school is like a jail.
- School frequently keeps me from doing what I want to do.

Educationally and socially, school can be an enriching or an inhibiting experience, as shown by responses to these items.

Description of the Student Population

Data were collected from students in kindergarten and in grades one, two, three, four, and seven in the Washington, D.C. schools during the 1978-79 school year. Table 2 presents the total number of students served in reading lab, math lab, or both, during the 1978-79 school year, and the number of Title I students for whom SIF and SOS data are available. It is these numbers upon which discussions of the data are based for each section of the report. Any student for whom this information was not available was omitted from the analysis.

As shown in Table 2, the number of students with SOS data was rather low due to problems in matching. Approximately 64 percent of the SOS data was matched

with student name and I.D. number, but only one-third of those children were identified as Title I students.

The subsequent section of this report is based on data from the SIF forms and includes a profile of the Title I child, the types of services they received, factors affecting their educational progress, and information about students' background, past school experience and current performance.

Table 2

Title I Students For Whom SIF and SOS Data are Available (1978-79)

Grade	Number of students served	SIF		SOS	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
K	2845	1719	60	--	--
1	3172	2465	78	1014	32
2	2697	2056	76	755	28
3	3147	2043	65	740	24
4	902	636	71	109	12
7	2091	1099	53	--	--
Total	14,854	10,018	67	2,618	18

PROFILE OF THE TITLE I CHILD

In the spring of 1979 each kindergarten through third grade, teacher and pilot fourth grade teacher in Title I schools completed a Student Information Form (SIF) for every student in his/her class (approximately 10,000 usable forms were completed on Title I students). Additionally, at the seventh grade, lab teachers completed SIF for students receiving lab services. The general purpose of this data collection activity is to obtain information on student participation in Title I, to develop a profile of Title I students to assist in program planning and operations, and to investigate those factors which may affect Title I students' educational progress. In the following section data collected from the SIFs are organized into a profile of the children served in Washington, D.C., Title I Program for 1978-79 and of the services they received. Among the student characteristics included in the profile are teacher perceptions of students' need for services, demographic and background factors, and school experiences.

The Students

Grade. There were over 10,000 children served by the Title I program in Washington this year for whom Student Information Forms are available. Table 3 shows the number of children for whom SIFs were available in each grade.[8]

Table 3

Title I Students with Completed SIFs in 1978-79 by Grade Level

Grade	Number of Title I students
K	1719
1	2465
2	2056
3	2043
4	636
7	1099
Total	10,018

[8]These figures represent those Title I students for hom usable SIFs are available. Throughout this report tables indicate the total number of respondents for each question with which the percentages for that table were computed.

Sex. Of the Title I students served during the school year, 54 percent were male and 46 percent were female. These ratios are fairly consistent across all grades, with males comprising more than half of the children served in each grade (Table 4).

Table 4

Sex of the Title I Child by Grade Level (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Female %	Male %
K	1640	48	52
1	2263	46	54
2	1848	44	56
3	1779	46	54
4	523	45	55
7	1068	45	55
Total	9,121	46	54

Repeaters. As might be expected, the relative number of repeaters tends to increase by grade level with the seventh grade having the most. This pattern was also observed in the 1977-78 evaluation. In the evaluation report from that year, the evaluators noted that repeaters tend to have lower grades and achievement gains at all levels than nonrepeaters although not significantly so. Table 5 presents the percentage of repeaters in each grade for 1978-79.

Table 5

Percentage of Students Repeating a Grade (1978-79)

Grade	Repeating present grade %	Repeating any grade %
K	5	3
1	24	9
2	20	21
3	13	28
4	16	30
7	18	34

Compared to last year's Title I population, fewer students repeated a grade in school. However, the pattern of repeating remains the same with each higher grade level reporting a greater number of repeaters.

Need for services. Children were identified for Title I services when they met one or more of the criteria for selection described in the Introduction. In part to examine the extent to which these students were perceived by the end of the year to need Title I services, teachers were asked to rate students according to their level of need. As data presented in Table 6 show, when students were rated according to their need for services, 28 percent of students receiving Title I services were rated by their teachers as having either low need or no need for services by their teachers.

Table 6

Teachers' Perceptions of Title I Students' Need for Services (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	n	No need %	Low need %	Mod need %	Great need %
K	1543	14	14	36	37
1	2323	9	10	32	49
2	1838	9	10	36	46
3	1899	7	12	39	41
4	529	6	8	41	45
7	968	9	12	43	36

Since 1976 students have been identified for Title I services by means of norm-referenced tests or by teacher referral and documentation in cases where test scores were unavailable or suspect. Previously only norm-referenced test data were used for identification, and, as a result, questions had been raised about the misclassification of children for Title I services. The addition of teacher recommendations as an alternative was intended to improve the selection process. However, there has remained a significant number of children

receiving services who have been rated as having relatively little need for services. For example, in the 1977-78 evaluation report the figures for teacher rating of "no need" were consistent with the present year's figures. The percentage of students still being classified as low in need may have occurred because of a natural regression toward the mean from their prior year's needs to the present. More importantly, their receipt of Title I services the previous year may have reduced their need for service.

Types of Title I Services Received

Title I services include supplementary instruction in reading and mathematics as well as a variety of supportive services. The levels of services provided are described in this section.

Classroom services. All Title I students receive 90 minutes of special classroom instruction per week. A substantial majority of Title I students received a full 36 weeks of classroom instruction during 1978-79. Table 7 represents the weeks of classroom assistance received by Title I students at each grade level.

Table 7

Number of Weeks Title I Classroom Services Were Received (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Number of weeks			
		≤ 10 %	11-20 %	21-30 %	> 30 %
K	1216	11	2	4	82
1	2033	7	8	11	74
2	1562	10	8	13	69
3	1736	6	6	16	71

Laboratory services. In addition to the classroom components, most Title I students attend special labs for specialized instruction in reading or math. Of the Title I students for whom data were available, an average of 89 percent received one or both types of lab services (Table 8).

Table 8

Percentage of Title I Children
Receiving Lab Services
(1978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Students receiving lab services
1	2167	8 %
2	1698	86
3	1728	89
4[a]	552	90
7	980	99

[a] Fourth graders received reading lab services only.

Tables 9 through 12 indicate the hours per week and weeks per year that Title I students received reading and math lab services. A substantial majority of students received reading lab services two and one-half hours to five hours per week. Similarly, the majority of students received two and one-half to five hours of math lab services each week.

Tutorial services. In addition to the Title I classroom and lab services, some Title I students receive tutorial services. As shown in Table 13, in 1978-79 nearly one-fourth of all students received tutorial services, and the majority of these were in the upper grades. Students generally attended the tutorial program for four to five hours each week. Except for the seventh graders, the majority of students received tutorial services for less than ten weeks. However, 63 percent of the seventh graders received services for more than ten weeks (Tables 14-15).

Supportive services. Over half of the Title I students received supportive services of some kind. The most common supportive service was additional staff assistance from lab aides, program assistants or parent volunteers, and in fewer

Table 9

Number of Hours Per Week of Reading Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Hours per week of reading lab services 0 - 1	1.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 5.0	>5.1[a]
1	1386	3%	20%	75%	2%
2	1148	4	14	77	4
3	1349	4	7	81	8
4	465	1	3	92	4
7	697	0	8	81	11

[a]The Title I program is structured to provide five hours of laboratory instruction per week.

Table 10

Number of Weeks of Reading Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Weeks per year of reading lab services ≤ 10	11 - 20	21 - 30	≥ 31
1	1419	7 %	22 %	24 %	47 %
2	1187	6	20	29	45
3	1271	7	16	20	58
4	477	24	36	23	16
7	726	2	14	8	75

Table 11

Number of Hours Per Week of Math Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Hours per week of math lab services 0 - 1	1.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 5.0	>5.1[a]
1	1392	2%	24%	71%	3%
2	1015	5	16	76	3
3	973	4	8	79	8
7	426	.7	12	87	0

[a]The Title I program is structured to provide five hours of laboratory instruction per week.

Table 12

Number of Weeks of Math Lab Services Received by Title I Students (1978-79) (in Percent)[a]

Grade	Number of respondents	Weeks per year of math lab services ≤10	11-20	21-30	≥31
1	1439	7 %	21 %	29 %	43 %
2	1024	9	22	21	47
3	991	5	18	22	54

[a]Data was unavailable for seventh graders.

Table I3

Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Grade (I978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Students receiving tutorial services
I	2253	8 %
2	I67I	2I
3	I78I	20
4	494	20
7	924	29

Table I4

Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Number of Days Per Week (I978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Days per week I	2	3	4	5
I	443	I %	3 %	I %	27 %	I7 %
2	56I	4	2	4	27	24
3	495	I	6	4	22	I6
4	286	0	0	0	I5	46
7	307	0	5	4	6	52

Table I5

Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Tutorial Services by Number of Weeks Per Year (I978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Weeks per year ≤ I0	I0-20	2I-30	≥ 3I
I	440	63 %	I0 %	I3 %	I4 %
2	5I4	56	I9	I2	I2
3	508	67	7	I0	I6
4	265	56	25	I5	4
7	29I	37	3	I6	44

Table I6

Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Supportive Services by Grade Level (I978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Students receiving supportive services
K	I489	7I %
I	2244	52
2	I724	54
3	I793	54
4	445	2I
7	919	67

Table 17

Type of Supportive Services Being Received
by Title I Students By Grade Levels
(1978-79)

Type	Grade K	1	2	3	4	7
Glasses/hearing aides	16	25	11	69	29	193
Parent volunteer	369	869	650	604	65	692
Program assistants	550	644	488	688	124	271
Clothing and shoes	72	109	81	128	76	199
Other	370	187	76	55	67	220
TOTAL	1565	2557	1913	2327	438	2308

cases, other staff members made arrangements for students to receive such items as glasses, hearing aides, clothing, and shoes (Tables 16-17).

Factors Affecting Title I Students' Educational Progress

Barriers to Educational Progress

One of the questions investigated in the 1978-79 evaluation was the factors which may hinder the educational progress of Title I students. It was thought that some students may experience a number of problems which might interfere with their educational progress. This section of the report describes the economic, behavioral and physical problems which may constitute barriers to the educational progress of Title I students.

Economic need. Somewhat surprisingly, the teachers indicated that only a little over 13 percent of the Title I students overall had economic need severe enough to interfere with their educational progress. As Table 18 indicates, the range reported by the teachers is from 10 to 20 percent of the students, with first graders most frequently identified as having this problem.

Table 18
Percentage of Students with Economic Need
(1978-79)

Grade	Students with economic need
K	12 %
1	20
2	16
3	12
4	10
7	10

This low rate is surprising in that Title I is a program which serves, by definition, under achieving children who reside in low-income areas. A higher percentage might well be expected. However, these figures reflect not only need, but need which is severe enough to interfere with a child's progress in school. That is, although many of the Title I students may come from low-income families, in the view of teachers this circumstance is not necessarily affecting their progress in school.

Behavior. Aggressive behavior was the most often noted behavioral problem for the Title I student. As Table 19 indicates, between 16 and 22 percent of the students in all grades evidenced aggressive behavior severe enough to interfere with their progress in school. The average occurrence of aggressive behavior was over 19 percent. A much smaller percentage of Title I students were perceived by their teachers to exhibit withdrawn behavior of sufficient magnitude to interfere with their progress in school. On the average, only seven percent of the students evidenced withdrawn behavior.

Table 19

Percentage of Students Demonstrating Aggressive Behavior

Grade	Students demonstrating aggressive behavior
K	20 %
1	20
2	19
3	22
4	21
7	16

Absenteeism is another behavioral problem which can interfere with the students' progress in school. Among the Title I population, long-term absences were found to hinder success in school. Between seven and 24 percent of the students were rated as being absent for periods long enough to affect their progress in school. Short-term but frequent absence did not appear to cause as many problems. In all grades except the seventh, the percentage of students having frequent, short-term absences was quite small (less than five percent on the average). However, 18 percent of the seventh graders evidenced frequent absenteeism severe enough to interfere with their progress in school.

Physical or health problems. In addition to certain behavioral or economic problems, a small number of Title I students were also reported to experience some physical or health problem which interferes with learning. Table 20 reports the results of the SIF question:

> "Do the records indicate that this student has any of the physical or health problems listed below which interfere with his/her educational progress?"

Table 20

Percentage of Title I Students with Physical or Health Problems (1978-79)[a]

Grade	Type of physical or health problem					
	Speech	Emotional	Hearing	Vision	Dental	Other
K	4 %	5 %	1 %	1 %	.3 %	2 %
1	4	7	1	2	1	2
2	2	4	1	3	.3	1
3	3	6	1	3	1	3
4	5	6	1	3	1	2
7	1	2	1	2	1	1

[a] Percentages are based on the total number of students for whom SIF data are available (see Table 2).

As data in the table indicate, emotional problems were those most often noted as interfering with school progress. Speech and vision problems were the second and third most frequently noted problems. Hearing and dental problems were less often noted.

Table 21 presents data on the percentage of the students who are known to have problems and are in fact receiving treatment. An average of three percent of all students suffering from emotional problems are receiving treatment. Speech problems are also often untreated, and in general it appears that few of the students with physical or health problems are receiving treatment.

Table 21

Percentage of Title I Students Who Have Physical or Health Problems Who are Being Treated (1978-79)

Grade	Title I students who are being treated					
	Speech	Emotional	Hearing	Vision	Dental	Other
K	8%	6%	0%	11%	20 %	6 %
1	1	1	4	0	0	2
2	0	0	15	3	0	0
3	0	0	0	2	9	6
4	13	6	14	5	20	7
7	8	4	17	22	11	7

Communication problems. In some instances communication problems may also contribute to the failure of Title I students to progress in school. For the most part problems communicating are related to either a lack of verbal communication (three to 12 percent of the students) or to the use of nonstandard English (seven to 11 percent of the students). Additionally, teachers noted some aural perception problems. Few children, however, had problems with communication linked to a dialect or a primary language other than English. Table 22 indicates the percentage of students who were evidencing problems with communication in this year's Title I population.

Table 22

Percentage of Title I Students Evidencing
A Communication Problem
(1978-79)[a]

Grade	Bilingual	Aural perception	Nonstandard English	Lack of verbal communication	Use of dialect
K	.8%	4%	11%	11%	1%
1	.7	5	7	12	9
2	1	2	9	7	1
3	.2	2	8	9	1
4	.3	4	6	12	0
7	2	.5	8	3	.09

[a]Percentages are based on the total number of Title I students for whom SIF data are available (see Table 2).

Parental Support

The Title I program has been developed and implemented as a support to needy students in the public schools. During the school year the system functions to provide students in designated low income areas with services to assist them in overcoming learning defects. Educators acknowledge, however, that special school services are only part of the remedy. The home and family contribute immeasurably to a student's success or failure in school. According to their teachers Title I students receive a substantial amount of support from their parents. As shown in

Table 23, in grades kindergarten through four over 75 percent of the parents were rated as supportive of their children's efforts in school. Parental support decreased in the seventh grade, where the rate dropped to 54 percent. Based on past evaluations of Title I and other programs, the drop in parental support at the upper grades was not surprising.

Table 23

Percentage of Title I Students
Receiving Parental Support (1978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Students receiving parental support
K	1517	83 %
1	2307	75
2	1759	80
3	1894	81
4	523	74
7	804	54

Title I parents demonstrate their support in a variety of ways, ranging from attendance at PTA meetings to written contacts with the teachers. Table 24 is a breakdown of the types of activities in which parents participate which indicate support for their children's educational efforts.

As data in Table 24 indicate, the most usual type of parental support was attendance at parent-teacher conferences and encouragement of the child's achievement. The least frequently noted type of support was membership in some formal school organization. The forms of support are fairly consistent across grades. Kindergarten parents tend to demonstrate their support through the provision of enriching experiences more often than do seventh grade parents; however, parents of seventh graders are more likely to participate in formal school organizations such as a Title I Parent Advisory Council (PAC).

Table 24

Percentage of Title I Students Receiving Various Types of Family Support by Grade (1979-79)[a]

	Grade					
	K	1	2	3	4	7
Parent-teacher conferences	61%	59%	59%	61%	53%	30%
Parent telephone calls to teachers	22	23	22	25	18	17
Attendance at school activities	25	19	18	23	16	10
Member of a PAC or other formal school organization	6	3	4	6	5	5
Written contacts with teachers	22	28	21	28	19	13
Encourages the child in his/her achievement	43	39	32	39	27	21
Provides enriching experiences	20	20	15	21	18	7
PTA or home-school meetings	29	23	25	29	25	13
Other	7	5	3	8	5	4

[a]Percentages are based on the total number of Title I students for whom SIF data are available (See Table 2).

Overall, considering the economic need, behavioral, physical or communication needs and the family support available, teachers noted that the background of their students affects their classroom functioning to a great extent. As presented in Table 25, between 68 and 78 percent of the students are affected by their background to a moderate or high degree.

Table 25

Degree to Which Title I Students Background Affects Functioning in the Classroom (1978 - 79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of respondents	Degree		
		Low	Moderate	High
K	1478	28%	59%	13%
1	2262	34	54	12
2	1739	32	58	10
3	1863	26	60	14
4	507	22	66	12
7	980	25	66	9

School Experience

There are a number of variables which should be considered when documenting the school experiences, past and present, of Title I students. These include experience with a preschool program, the number of interruptions through new classroom or school assignments, and pattern of absences in the present school year.

Preschool experience. Research in early education suggests that a preschool experience is valuable for short-term gains for children as measured by certain intelligence and social adjustment scales (Ryan, 1974). Positive long-term

results (such as fewer repeats of grades or decreased need for special services) have also been noted in longitudinal studies of the effects of preschool experience (Palmer and Lazar, 1978). Preschool experience, then, is a factor which may have impact on school success for the Title I student. Over 78 percent of the students in grades kindergarten, one, two, three, four and seven had experienced some form of a preschool program. Table 26 indicates the reported incidence of preschool experience among this group of students.

Table 26

Percentage of Title I Students with Preschool Experience by Grade Level (1978-79)

Grade	Number of respondents	Students having preschool experience
K	1525	76 %
1	2354	93
2	1867	91
3	1942	86
4	557	88
7	963	47

As Table 26 illustrates, a large portion of the lower grade children had experienced some form of preschool. Over half of the seventh grade children, however, had not benefited from a preschool program. This pattern is somewhat different from that of the 1977-78 school year, in which over 90 percent of the children in grades one, two, three and four had experienced preschool.

Continuity. Learning is a sequential, cumulative process. This process may best be instituted by provision of an uninterrupted learning experience for the learner. It is important to recognize the extent to which the learning situation is disrupted through changes in classroom

assignment during the year or through changes in schools because the family moves. In general, the Title I student appears to have received an uninterrupted learning experience this year. Table 27 indicates the percentage of students who were enrolled in the same class with the same teacher throughout the 1978-79 school year. Excluding seventh graders, over 91 percent of all Title I students were enrolled in the same class for the entire school year. However, one-third of the seventh grade students had switched classrooms or schools during the year.

Table 27

Percentage of Students Enrolled
in the Same Classroom Throughout 1978-79 School Year

Grade	Number of respondents	Students enrolled in same classroom
K	1623	91 %
1	2406	91
2	1922	94
3	1993	93
4	585	92
7	1020	64

Absenteeism. Continuity may also be affected when a student is absent from school for any length of time. The Title I students generally were not chronically absent from school with over 75 percent of the students missing only 10 days or less for the entire school year. About 15 percent missed three weeks of school and only a small minority missed more than three weeks. The seventh graders missed the largest portion of school, with 12 percent of them missing over 30 days of classroom time.

Table 28

Title I Student Absenteeism by Grade (1978-79) (in Percent)

Grade	Number of days absent					
	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 +
K	59%	17%	4%	2%	.2%	.4%
1	65	14	4	.7	.3	.2
2	66	66	2	.5	.1	.4
3	74	11	2	.5	.05	.1
4	70	9	3	1	.5	.5
7	56	12	5	3	.9	1

Summary of the Characteristics of the Title I Student Population

The group of Title I students for the 1978-79 school year was composed of slightly more boys than girls. Their school experience began, for the most part, with some preschool program. Few of them transferred from one class or school to another during the year, a circumstance which afforded them substantial continuity in their learning experience. Continuity was also shown by the small numbers of days they have missed school. In comparison to past groups of Title I students, fewer of the present group have repeated a grade. In addition, the Title I students received a substantial amount of family support.

Although the profile of the Title I students was positive, they did experience some problems which may have interfered with their progress in school. Economic need affected 10 to 20 percent of the students. A number of them had behavioral problems and certain physical or emotional problems.

AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF TITLE I STUDENTS

Introduction

The previous section of this report provided a demographic profile of the Title I student based on data from the Student Information Form (SIF). Included in this profile were teacher ratings of five personal attributes of Title I students (Self Concept, Attitude Toward School, Social Skills, Self Confidence and Peer Relationships). This section presents the results from the student-administered self-concept instrument, the Self Observation Scales (SOS), which measures perceptions students have of themselves (These scales have been described in detail on pages 9 through I6). Additionally, teacher ratings of the students self-concept characteristics are related to the students self-perceptions on scales such as Self Acceptance, Social Maturity, School Affiliation and Self Security.

Sample

Data were available for over 2600 children in grades one through four. There were so few kindergarten and seventh grade scores available that they have been omitted from this report. Table 29 indicates the numbers of children

Table 29

Sample Distribution of the Students Responding to the Self Observation Scales (SOS) (1978-79)

Grade	Number Responding
1	1,014
2	755
3	740
4	109
Total	2,618

for whom SOS scores were available for each grade. Male and female scores have been combined for ease of presentation since little discernible differences have been noted in the past.

Scale Scores for Title I Students

Overall, the Title I students scored near or slightly above the national norm for three of the four subscales. For two of these three scales, however, the mean score for grades one through three decreased year-to-year. That is, for example, first grade students scored a mean NCE of 51.2 for Self Acceptance while third graders scored a mean 8 points below that at 43.3. In instances, however, these means are within one standard deviation from the norm and are therefore within normal limits. For both Self Security and Social Maturity the mean scores increased from first to third grades.

Interpretation of these scores suggests that the Title I students do not differ dramatically from the population in general upon whom the SOS was normed. They have an overall feeling that they are important to other people including peers and authority figures. School appears to be a positive influence in their lives and they seem to like school. The Title I student is generally no more anxious than other children his age ($\bar{x}$ = 46.1) and seems to have an acceptable level of emotional stability. The most notable exception to the normal scores was Social Maturity,where the Title I students scored significantly below national norms (27.2, 35.9, 41.6, and 35.0). These scores indicate that the Title I students may have problems viewing themselves as independent. They may be somewhat unsure of themselves in social situations. However, their scores improve from first to second to third grades at a rate far greater than that of the norm population, which suggests rapid progress in this area.

Table 30

Mean NCE Scores of Title I Students
Across Self-Concept Subscores (1978-79)

Grade	Self Acceptance	Social Maturity	School Affiliation	Self Security
1	51.2	27.2	52.9	44.2
2	46.4	35.9	54.2	48.3
3	43.3	41.6	51.3	46.8
4	51.9	35.0	70.3	42.5

SOS Scale Scores Related to Teacher-Rated Student Strengths

Table 31 is a breakdown of the Title I student scores by the five teacher-rated student attributes. As the table indicates, there is a positive relationship between each of the five student attributes and the subscale Self Acceptance of the SOS. In every case those students who were rated high on each attribute scored above the national norm for Self Acceptance. These children view themselves positively and obviously the teachers do also. There was little variation across grades for the highly rated students.

Table 32 illustrates the relationship between scores for Social Maturity and teacher-rated student attributes. In every case those students rated most highly by the teachers also scored highest on Social Maturity. In only the third grade were scores near the norm. First grade students who were rated low on their personal attributes were at most two standard deviations below the norm Social Maturity. Those students who were rated low on Social Skills were also the lowest scorers for Social Maturity. One would expect a relationship such as this given that Social Maturity measures the positive view children have of their relationship with others, and poor social skills are indicative of uncertainty in social situations. The data indicate that the Title I students are least like the norm group in their relationship with others. They appear to be somewhat unsure of themselves, and the teachers perceived this

Table 31

Self Acceptance Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (1978-79) (in NCEs)

Student Attributes (SIF)	SOS Means (by Grade) First	Second	Third	Fourth
Self Concept				
Low	48.6	40.2	33.7	47.8
Med	51.3	44.6	41.7	53.3
High	53.7	50.5	50.3	53.6
Attitude Toward School				
Low	48.3	41.3	37.9	33.2
Med	51.1	45.4	41.4	53.0
High	54.1	51.4	49.2	52.0
Social Skills				
Low	51.9	40.4	35.6	56.9
Med	51.0	45.9	41.7	48.9
High	55.0	51.7	51.1	59.9
Self Confidence				
Low	48.8	44.4	34.5	23.0
Med	51.7	46.6	43.3	50.8
High	54.3	52.4	50.0	56.8
Peer Relationships				
Low	48.5	42.6	35.4	40.3
Med	51.4	45.7	41.3	50.5
High	54.1	49.1	50.4	58.2

Table 32

Social Maturity Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)

Student Attributes (SIF)	SOS Means (by Grade) First	Second	Third	Fourth
Self Concept				
Low	18.2	33.5	42.4	26.7
Med	27.0	34.2	40.0	34.0
High	30.6	39.2	46.3	42.3
Attitude Toward School				
Low	18.0	32.3	39.2	12.9
Med	26.3	33.5	40.0	33.9
High	30.6	39.1	44.3	44.4
Social Skills				
Low	18.4	30.9	37.1	28.3
Med	26.7	35.4	41.4	33.4
High	31.6	37.7	47.5	44.5
Self Confidence				
Low	18.5	30.7	35.4	22.9
Med	26.7	36.1	41.2	31.3
High	33.5	38.9	45.1	43.7
Peer Relationships				
Low	18.5	29.3	36.8	37.6
Med	26.9	35.2	41.0	32.5
High	31.3	38.3	45.9	43.3

uncertainty. There is a positive indication, however, that the Title I students improve their situations in that their increase in scores from year to year is at a faster rate than the increase in the norming population. Those in the high group for other attributes approached the norm limits in the second through fourth grades.

Title I students scored highest on School Affiliation. Those rated by their teachers as high on the five personal attributes from the SIF scored notably higher on this subscale. Fourth grade students scored from one to two standard deviations above the norm. This finding suggests that these students view school as a positive influence in their lives. Those whom teachers rated as having a good attitude toward school also indicated this good attitude on the SOS (Table 33).

Children who were rated highly by teachers on all five personal attributes scored high on the subscale Self Security. If the Title I students were rated low by their teachers on these same attributes, their scores were from 10-15 points lower on the subscale Self Security. Thus, there appears to be a high correlation between Self Security and the five attributes from the SIF. This is understandable since students with little self security would be less likely to be confident about themselves. They would be more likely to be anxious, depressed, and unsure of themselves.

Summary

In general, then, the Title I students differed very little from the norming group in self-concept. The major variation occurred in the area of Social Maturity, where the Title I students score significantly below the norm. Although school is important to them and they are accepting of themselves, they do not evidence a mature attitude or behavior. Overall, for all four of the

Table 33

School Affiliation Scale for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)

Student Attributes (SIF)	SOS Means (by Grade) First	Second	Third	Fourth
Self Concept				
Low	51.6	50.3	52.8	68.2
Med	52.0	54.2	49.5	73.7
High	47.7	56.6	53.3	73.0
Attitude Toward School				
Low	47.7	53.0	47.5	69.9
Med	51.6	53.8	49.5	72.0
High	51.1	58.0	59.9	69.4
Social Skills				
Low	52.1	54.0	50.6	69.5
Med	51.7	54.4	50.4	70.9
High	49.8	52.8	53.8	74.2
Self Confidence				
Low	51.4	53.6	49.5	47.0
Med	51.8	54.3	51.3	73.9
High	46.7	56.2	56.3	74.5
Peer Relationships				
Low	48.1	51.5	52.9	35.3
Med	52.7	54.6	50.0	72.5
High	51.4	54.0	55.1	72.7

Table 34

Self Security Scale Means for Various Strengths of Title I Students (in NCEs) (1978-79)

Student Attributes (SIF)	SOS Means (by Grade) First	Second	Third	Fourth
Self Concept				
Low	30.8	46.6	44.1	44.2
Med	44.1	46.5	45.6	41.7
High	50.2	49.7	51.1	42.0
Attitude Toward School				
Low	30.3	46.0	49.1	32.3
Med	43.9	46.9	45.0	44.1
High	49.0	49.1	50.2	38.5
Social Skills				
Low	31.2	43.3	39.7	41.4
Med	43.2	47.1	45.9	42.2
High	50.4	52.7	52.8	44.3
Self Confidence				
Low	31.9	43.7	40.0	29.8
Med	43.6	48.5	46.6	38.4
High	51.9	51.7	49.6	49.8
Peer Relationships				
Low	34.9	48.1	33.5	76.3
Med	42.6	47.7	46.2	44.2
High	48.7	50.6	50.6	42.2

subscales of the SOS, higher teacher ratings on pupil characteristics correlated positively with higher NCE scores for the scales. Teachers' perceptions of the students generally matched the students' own perceptions.

TEACHER RATINGS OF AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF REPEATING AND NONREPEATING STUDENTS

There have been numerous studies conducted on the benefits and costs of retaining children in a grade for an added year (Owen & Ranick, 1977; Gregg, 1975; Reiter, 1973). Much of the work that has been conducted has focused on the effects that grade retention has on the child's self-concept and his/her relationship with peers. A major concern of educators is that retaining a child for one or more school years may cause that child to have a lower self-concept. In addition, there is concern that nonpromotion removes children from their appropriate peer group. The effect would be to interfere with the child's development of socially appropriate and desirable peer relationships. Intuitively, one might expect the presence of these undesirable consequences. However, research evidence has not supported these fears.

In 1975 Finlayson reported on a study in two suburban school districts in Pennsylvania in which nonpromoted, borderline and promoted pupils were studied. Teacher and parent interviews and a self-administered self-concept scale were used to determine the effects of grade retention on the students. Among his findings was that the nonpromoted students were the only ones to have significant increases in self-concept scores over the two years of the study. Promoted and borderline students tended to have a decrease in their self-concept scores. Teachers and parents concurred in their opinions about the students' self-concept. Nonpromoted students were not usually considered discipline problems, nor were they withdrawn in class. Parents saw their children as liking school better and as more confident and successful in school. They also rated the peer relationships of their children as either the same or better than before.

Reiter (1973), in a review of studies on retention since 1965, suggests that no anwer to the promotion/retention question has been demonstrated, and that the more important question is how the student is advanced. Automatic promotion has been shown to be "less satisfactory" than a policy of automatic retention. Owen and Ranick (1977) support nonpromotion in the results of their work.

In the present evaluation, teachers of Title I students were asked to rate each of their students on self-concept and other social characteristics. These rankings were analyzed comparing students who had previously or were presently repeating a grade with those who had never repeated. This report documents the findings of those analyses for grades one, two, and three. The characteristics upon which rankings were made included: Self Concept, Attitude Toward School, Social Skills, Self Confidence and Peer Relationships. Repeaters (children who presently, or in the past, repeated a grade) are compared to promoted (children who have never repeated a grade in school) within the two groups of children who received math lab services and reading lab services. The data are presented first for the children who received math lab services and then for the children who received reading lab services. Within these two groups relevant information is presented by grade for grades one, two, and three.

Teachers rated the students on the five characteristics listed below. The ratings were done on a five-point scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The boundaries for rating each characteristic are as follows:

Self Concept	High: Seems happy and appears to feel important to self and others. Low: Seems unhappy and feels unimportant to self and others.
Attitude Toward School	High: Enjoys school and school-related activities. Low: Seems unhappy in school, does not enjoy school activities.

Social Skills	High:	Appears to be independent, persistent, considerate of other people in social situations.
	Low:	Appears uncertain in social situations, is confused about relating to others.
Self-Confidence	High:	Appears to be comfortable with self, confident regarding ability to handle new experience and to perform assigned tasks.
	Low:	Appears to be anxious and unsure, particularly when confronted with new or demanding experiences.
Peer Relationships	High:	Enjoys being with other children and relates to them easily.
	Low:	Seems to feel other children are unfriendly and does not have many friends.

Children Receiving Math Lab Services

Sample. Teachers rated children from grades one, two and three who had received math lab services this school year. Table 35 indicates the number of children per grade for whom data are available by their status as repeaters or nonrepeaters.

Table 35

Number of Repeaters and Nonrepeaters Who Received Math Lab Services for Whom SOS Data are Available (1978-79)

Grade	Number of children	Number of repeaters	Number of nonrepeaters
1	1392	438	954
2	981	364	617
3	968	341	627

Within the group of children identified as repeaters there are three types: 1) present repeaters, 2) previous repeaters and 3) past and present repeaters. By definition a present repeater is repeating the grade in which he/she is presently enrolled. A previous repeater is not repeating his/her present grade

but has repeated a grade in the past. A past and present repeater is repeating a grade now and has also repeated a grade in the past. Where there are noteworthy distinctions between these three groups it is noted. For the majority of the report, however, the data are presented generally as repeaters versus nonrepeaters.

Grade One. Those children who have never repeated a grade in school were consistently rated higher in all five characteristics than were those who had repeated one or more grades. Table 36 presents the ratings for repeaters and nonrepeaters for the five variables. Repeaters were twice as likely to score in the lowest range on Attitude Toward School and Self-Confidence as were the nonrepeaters. They rarely were ranked highest on any of the characteristics (from four to 10 percent in this category). Contributing to this pattern were very low rankings for students who had both repeated a grade and were repeating the present grade. There was no consistent pattern differentiating present repeaters from past repeaters, but repeaters of both were consistently ranked lowest.

Table 36

Ratings of Math Lab Student Characteristics for First Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Low Ratings 1	2	3	4	High 5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	6 %	13%	43%	23%	15 %
Repeaters	10	21	42	17	10
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	5	10	43	24	18
Repeaters	10	17	46	19	9
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	8	14	44	22	12
Repeaters	11	21	42	14	5
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	8	18	41	21	12
Repeaters	16	27	38	15	4
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	5	10	45	25	16
Repeaters	8	17	46	20	9

Table 37 demonstrates the ratings on student self-confidence for repeaters broken down by the type of repeaters; Present, Past or Past and Present.

Table 37

High (4 & 5) and Low (1 & 2) Scores for Self Confidence for Repeaters Past, Present and Past and Present (1978-79) (in Percent)

Type of Repeaters	Scores Low	High
Present	44%	21%
Past	33	14
Past/Present	62	14

Grade Two. As Table 38 indicates, second grade math lab students were ranked by their teachers in a very similar manner. Nonrepeaters are ranked higher than repeaters across all characteristics. The scores at the extremes for

Table 38

Ratings of Student Characteristics for Second Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Low Ratings 1	2	3	4	High 5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	3%	13%	41%	27%	16%
Repeaters	8	21	39	23	10
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	2	11	39	30	18
Repeaters	10	18	38	26	9
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	5	15	43	25	13
Repeaters	10	28	37	20	4
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	6	18	39	24	13
Repeaters	14	28	37	17	5
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	3	10	41	28	17
Repeaters	6	18	41	27	9

the ranking continuum are almost identical. For example, Self Concept scores for first and second grade repeaters are: Low 10 percent and eight percent; High 10 percent and 10 percent. The pattern continues for all five characteristics with extreme scores varying by only one to two percent.

Grade Three. Table 39 illustrates the rankings given to third grade students by their teachers. As the table indicates there is a continuation of the trend for repeaters to be ranked consistently lower than the nonrepeaters. In addition, the pattern of rankings from characteristic to characteristic is also quite similar to the first and second grade patterns. Table 40 represents the extremes of the rankings for all three grades. As it illustrates, there is a consistent pattern of rankings for all three grades. The nonrepeaters are ranked more often at the high extreme and less often at the low extreme than are the repeaters.

Table 39

Ratings of Student Characteristics for Third Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Ratings Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	4 %	9 %	43 %	29 %	15 %
Repeaters	11	22	44	16	5
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	4	10	38	30	18
Repeaters	10	20	45	20	6
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	5	13	45	25	13
Repeaters	12	25	47	12	3
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	6	17	39	25	13
Repeaters	18	29	37	12	4
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	4	10	40	29	17
Repeaters	11	18	47	17	7

Table 40

High and Low Extreme Rankings for the Characteristics Across Grades 1, 2 and 3 (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Low Grades 1	2	3	High Grades 1	2	3
Self Concept						
Nonrepeaters	6 %	3 %	4 %	15 %	16 %	15 %
Repeaters	10	8	11	10	10	5
Attitude Toward School						
Nonrepeaters	5	2	4	18	18	18
Repeaters	10	10	10	9	9	6
Social Skills						
Nonrepeaters	8	5	5	12	13	13
Repeaters	11	10	12	5	4	3
Self Confidence						
Nonrepeaters	8	6	6	12	13	13
Repeaters	16	14	18	4	5	4
Peer Relationships						
Nonrepeaters	5	3	4	16	17	17
Repeaters	8	6	11	9	9	7

Throughout the rankings of repeaters and nonrepeaters those who repeated both in the past and the present year obtained the largest percentage of low rankings on the scale and the smallest percentage of high rankings. There was little difference in scores between the past and present repeater groups. Table 41 presents the low rankings (1 and 2) and high rankings (4 and 5) for each grade and each characteristic. The major differences which appeared across grades were in the previous repeater group and in the both present and past repeater group.

Table 41

Present, Past and Present/Past Repeaters:
Percentage of Students Ranked High and Low
(1978-79)

	Grades 1		2		3	
	Low (1&2)	High (4&5)	Low (1&2)	High (4&5)	Low (1&2)	High (4&5)
Self Concept						
Present	31 %	28 %	25 %	33 %	31 %	16 %
Past	19	24	31	33	23	26
Both	43	19	35	28	42	21
Attitude Toward School						
Present	27	29	26	35	28	20
Past	27	22	27	38	29	30
Both	32	27	33	33	42	17
Social Skills						
Present	38	21	39	27	38	14
Past	34	15	36	25	36	17
Both	57	9	48	16	42	13
Self Confidence						
Present	44	21	42	22	42	10
Past	33	14	41	22	48	18
Both	62	14	55	16	42	13
Peer Relationships						
Present	24	32	25	34	28	21
Past	26	18	22	36	29	26
Both	37	22	31	34	58	21

Children Receiving Reading Lab Services

Sample. Teachers' ratings on the social characteristics portion of the SIF are reported on students in grades one, two and three who received reading lab services. Table 42 presents the number of children for whom these data are available by their status as nonrepeaters or repeaters. For ease of presentation, the data from the three types of repeaters are aggregated except when significant variations occur.

Table 42

Number of Repeaters and Nonrepeaters Receiving Reading Lab Services by Grade (1978-79)

Grade	Number of children	Number of repeaters	Number of nonrepeaters
1	1361	521	840
2	1120	468	652
3	1342	491	851

Grade One. For first grade students very little differentiation was observed between the repeater and nonrepeater groups' teacher ratings. All five characteristics appear to have ratings for both repeaters and nonrepeaters which approximately represent the normal distribution. As Table 43 indicates, Social Skills and Self Confidence are somewhat skewed toward the lower end of the scale for both groups, which can be expected for first grade students. Any differences between the two groups are slight, but somewhat favorable to the nonrepeaters.

The most significant comparison of children's scores involves breaking the repeater group into its three types of repeaters. Data in Table 44 show that the repeater of both past and present grades scored significantly below the other repeaters. The number of children in this group for the first grade is so small, however, that there is little effect on the entire score for the repeater group. Most notable in this breakdown is that the majority of the Self Confidence ratings of the past and present repeaters were low. It appears that a first grade student who had already repeated kindergarten and was repeating first grade would be likely to have some problems with self confidence.

Table 43

Ratings of Reading Lab Student Characteristics for First Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Ratings Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	7%	16%	47%	19%	11%
Repeaters	12	19	42	16	10
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	8	12	46	21	13
Repeaters	12	19	43	17	9
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	10	16	47	19	9
Repeaters	13	24	41	17	5
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	12	20	45	16	7
Repeaters	17	26	38	15	5
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	8	12	50	21	11
Repeaters	9	18	44	20	10

Table 44

Low Scores (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Type of repeater Present	Past	Past/Present
Self Concept	53%	27%	42%
Attitude Toward School	31	26	36
Social Skills	38	30	42
Self Confidence	44	32	60
Peer Relationships	27	25	37

Grade Two. Second grade students who had never repeated a grade in school were less likely to be rated at the lower end of the rating scales, but were no more likely to be rated at the upper end of the scale than were children who had repeated. The ratings for both groups across all five characterist.cs follow the normal distribution, although slightly skewed toward the positive end of the scale for Self Concept, Attitude Toward School and Peer Relationships. Table 45 presents the ratings for both repeaters and nonrepeaters.

Table 45

Ratings of Reading Lab Students' Characteristics for Second Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

	Ratings				
	Low				High
Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	3 %	14 %	48 %	24 %	12 %
Repeaters	7	21	40	20	12
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	2	12	44	27	13
Repeaters	8	18	38	24	11
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	4	17	49	21	9
Repeaters	10	26	39	18	6
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	6	19	45	21	9
Repeaters	12	26	40	16	6
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	3	12	49	24	12
Repeaters	7	13	41	24	11

Of all the repeaters, those who had repeated the present and a previous grade were most often rated at the lower end of the scale. Table 46 illustrates this point. The low ratings are most notable for Self Confidence (51 percent) and Social Skills (61 percent).

Table 46

Low Scores (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Type of Repeater		
	Present	Past	Past/Present
Self Concept	24 %	30 %	35 %
Attitude Toward School	23	27	44
Social Skills	33	36	61
Self Confidence	34	40	51
Peer Relationships	23	41	35

Grade Three. Of the 1342 third grade students receiving reading lab services, 491 were repeaters. The difference between these children and the 851 third graders who had never repeated was much more obvious than for first and second grade students. The repeater group consistently scored at lower rating levels. Repeaters were two to three times more often included in the lowest rating. At the high extreme of the scale nonrepeaters were represented at a two to three times greater rate. Table 47 presents the ratings for all characteristics by repeaters and nonrepeaters.

Table 47

Ratings of Reading Lab Student Characteristics for Third Grade Repeaters and Nonrepeaters (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Ratings Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Self Concept					
Nonrepeaters	3%	10%	44%	28%	16%
Repeaters	9	21	46	16	6
Attitude Toward School					
Nonrepeaters	3	8	40	28	20
Repeaters	10	20	46	17	7
Social Skills					
Nonrepeaters	3	14	45	24	13
Repeaters	11	26	47	12	4
Self Confidence					
Nonrepeaters	4	16	43	24	13
Repeaters	16	29	39	12	4
Peer Relationships					
Nonrepeaters	3	9	41	29	18
Repeaters	8	19	48	17	9

There was very little difference in ratings within the repeater group for the various types of repeaters as illustrated in Table 48.

Table 48

Low Score (1&2) for Characteristics for Repeaters by Present, Past and Past/Present Types (1978-79) (in Percent)

Characteristics	Type of repeater Present	Past	Past/Present
Self Concept	35%	29%	33%
Attitude Toward School	32	28	39
Social Skills	43	34	35
Self Confidence	48	43	53
Peer Relationships	30	25	32

Math and Reading Lab Summary

Generally nonrepeaters, whether receiving math or reading lab services, were judged more favorably by teachers in all characteristics. For math lab students in first through third grades, the pattern was highly consistent across grades. There was slightly more variation across grades for the reading lab students. In that group the repeaters and nonrepeaters were rated similarly in the first and second grades, but were differentiated in the third grade, with nonrepeaters being judged more positively than repeaters.

There was a tendency for repeaters of both past and present grades to be the least positively rated of all the groups. The present repeaters and the past repeaters demonstrated no clearcut patterns across all the characteristics and grades.

AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF REPEATING AND NONREPEATING STUDENTS REPORTED BY THE STUDENTS

Student scores on the SOS were also analyzed comparing scores of repeating Title I students to scores of nonrepeating students. These analyses suggest that there is little difference between the scores of the two groups. Table 49 shows the mean NCE scores for both groups of students for grades one through four. Where there are differences, the nonrepeating students scored higher than the repeating students. The exception is that repeating students in grades two and four scored somewhat higher in the area of School Affiliation.

Table 49

Mean SOS Scores for Repeating and Nonrepeating Title I Students (in NCEs)

	Grade			
	1	2	3	4
Self Acceptance				
Repeaters	47.7	45.1	39.6	51.5
Nonrepeaters	51.3	46.2	42.8	52.1
Social Maturity				
Repeaters	25.9	32.8	42.9	34.8
Nonrepeaters	27.7	36.8	41.3	34.5
School Affiliation				
Repeaters	51.6	55.6	49.9	70.9
Nonrepeaters	51.0	54.4	51.1	64.6
Self Security				
Repeaters	38.5	44.7	46.1	41.3
Nonrepeaters	43.5	48.9	46.6	41.0

Student perception and teacher perception of student affective development, then, are quite similar. As indicated in the previous section, teachers generally rated nonrepeaters higher than repeaters on the five positive strengths listed on the SIF (self concept, attitude toward school, social skills, self confidence, and peer relationships). As data in Table 49 show, nonrepeating students also tended to rate themselves slightly higher on factors related to self concept than did repeaters.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Among the areas examined in the evaluation of the 1978-79 Title I program were questions concerning the extent to which environmental and demographic factors affect Title I students' educational development and the extent to which Title I students' affective development may have impact on their educational achievement. To examine these questions data were collected from teachers of Title I students on a Student Information Form designed for this evaluation; from the group-administered Self-Observation Scales, which assesses student self-concept; and from the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills administered to Title I students in Spring 1978.

Among the major findings derived from this phase of the evaluation are the following:

- Almost 90 percent of Title I identified students for whom data were available received supplementary instructional services in the laboratory. Most students attended the lab between two and one-half and five hours per week throughout the school year.

- Nearly one-fourth of Title I students also participated in the tutorial component of the program, with seventh graders receiving tutorial services for the longest period of time during the school year.

- Among the social and demographic factors considered by teachers as seriously interfering with the educational progress of some Title I students were economic need (13 percent), aggressive behavior (20 percent), and absenteeism (particularly among seventh graders).

- While relatively few Title I students experienced serious physical or health problems, among those students with such problems very few were receiving treatment.

- According to their teachers, a substantial proportion (over 75 percent) of Title I students receive strong parental support for their educational efforts. Types of parental support provided included parent conferences with teachers, attendance at PTA meetings, and attendance at school activities.

- Nearly 80 percent of Title I students had attended preschool.

- Among Title I students for whom SOS scores were available, results indicated that Title I students score at or slightly above the national norm on such positive characteristics as school affiliation, self-acceptance, and self-security.

- Generally Title I students scored below national norms on social maturity, although their scores on this characteristic tended to increase across grades.

- In general students whose SOS' indicated a high self-concept were also perceived by their teachers to exhibit such positive strengths as high self-concept, good peer relationships, positive attitude toward school, well-developed social skills, and a high level of self-confidence.

- Students who had repeated one or more grades generally were rated by teachers to exhibit lower levels of positive strengths than did nonrepeaters. This finding was consistent across grades as well as for both reading and mathematics laboratory students. Students with consistently lowest ratings on positive strengths were those who had repeated both the present and a past grade.

- Scale scores on the SOS for repeating and nonrepeating students did not vary significantly, although nonrepeaters tended to score slightly higher than repeaters. The exception to this pattern occurred for second and fourth graders on school affiliation with repeaters scoring slightly higher than nonrepeaters.

While these findings are substantially in agreement with those from previous evaluations, they do emphasize the continuing need of educationally deprived students for the specialized instructional and other services provided by the Title I program. Further, particular attention to the developmental needs of repeating students, particularly those who have repeated a grade more than once, appears to be warranted.

References

Anderson, K. M. "Cognitive style" and school failure. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Anthropological Association, San Diego, California, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 253)

Finlayson, H. J. The effect of nonpromotion upon the self concept of pupils in primary grades. Dissertation Abstract, Temple University, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 155 556)

Guthrie, J. T., Samuels, S. J., Martuza, V., Seifert, M., Tyler, S. J., and Edwall, G. A study of the locus and nature of reading problems in the elementary school: Final report. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127 567)

Hess, F., Comp. Issues in education: A documented look at seven current topics. East Syracuse-Mimosa Schools, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 391)

Owens, S.A. and Ranick, D. L. The Greensville program: A commonsense approach to basics. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 58, 531-33, 539.

Reiter, R. G. The promotion/retention dilemma: What research tells us. Report No. 7416. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Philadelphia School District, Office of Research and Evaluation, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 412)

Virgin, A. E. and Shecter, H. E. Accuracy of kindergarten teachers' predictions of their pupils subsequent performance: Research report. Willowdale, Ontario: North York. Board of Education 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130 766)

Weinstein, R. S. and Middlestadt, S. E. Learning about the achievement hierarchy of the classroom: Through children's eyes. Berkeley, California: University of California, Berkeley,1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 071)

APPENDIX A

1978-79 Student Information Form

STUDENT INFORMATION FORM

MARKING DIRECTIONS

- Use only black lead pencil. No. 2 or less.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray markings of any kind.

Proper ● Improper ✓ X O

Student Name:

Last | First

Student I.D.

Student Grade

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Sex

Male Female

Birthdate:

Mo. | Day | Year

2454-COP-5A32

1. Is this student identified for Title I services? Yes No

2. If Yes, please mark the appropriate space which indicates the total number of weeks the student received Title I classroom instruction during the 1978-79 school year:

Weeks of Title I Classroom Instruction

3. Did this student receive Title I lab services during 1978-79? Yes No

If Yes, please mark the appropriate spaces which best indicate the average number of hours per week and the total number of weeks this student received service in:

READING LAB

Hours per week: 0–1; 1.1–2.5; 2.6–5; 5.1–7.5; 7.6–10; Above 10

Weeks per year

MATHEMATICS LAB

Hours per week: 0–1; 1.1–2.5; 2.6–5; 5.1–7.5; 7.6–10; Above 10

Weeks per year

4. Did this student receive Title I tutorial services during 1978-79? Yes No

If Yes, please mark the appropriate spaces which indicate the number of days per week and the total number of weeks this student received tutorial services in:

READING

Days per week

Weeks per year

MATHEMATICS

Days per week

Weeks per year

5. If Title I services were interrupted during the year, please mark the appropriate space which indicates why the student stopped participation in Title I:

- Moved away from the school district
- Late entry into the Title I program
- Late identification of eligibility for Title I
- Early achievement of Title I objectives
- Other

6. Did this student receive Title I supportive services during 1978-79? Yes No

7. If yes, please indicate the extent to which the student received each of the following: Mark all that apply.

Classes:	Never	Very little	Some-what	Consider-ably	Very much	Does not Apply
Hearing Aide						
Laboratory Aide						
Parent Volunteer						
Program Assistant						
Planning and Grades						
Other (specify)						

8. Has this student been enrolled in your classroom for the entire school year?
   ○ Yes ○ No

9. Which of the following areas do you perceive as interfering with the student's educational progress? Mark all that apply.
   - Economic Need
   - Absenteeism – periodic short term
   - Absenteeism – occasional long term
   - Withdrawn Behavior
   - Disruptive Behavior

10. To your knowledge, is the student's family supportive of his/her efforts?
    ○ Yes ○ No

If Yes, please mark all the ways in which their parents have demonstrated support.

	Yes	No
Parent-teacher conferences		
Parent telephone calls to teachers		
Attendance at school activities		
Member of a PAC or other formal school organization		
Written contacts with teachers		
Encourages the child in his/her achievement		
Provides enriching experiences		
PTA or home-school meetings		
Other		

11. Do the records indicate that this student has any of the physical or health problems listed below which interfere with his/her educational progress? Mark all that apply.

	Yes	No	Indicate if being treated
Speech			
Emotional			
Hearing			
Vision			
Dental			
Other Health Problems			

12. To the best of your knowledge, has the student had any kindergarten experience?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Don't Know

13. Is this student repeating this grade?
    ○ Yes ○ No

14. Has this student repeated any other grade?
    ○ Yes ○ No

15. Considering the needs of the students in your classroom, what priority would you assign to this student for special services offered through the Title I program?
    - No special need
    - Lowest degree of need
    - Moderate degree of need
    - High degree of need

16. Indicate the student's current working level in Reading and Mathematics.

	READING Book	READING Level	MATHEMATICS Book	MATHEMATICS Level
RR				
Pre-primer				
Primer				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9+				

17. To your knowledge, which of the following communication patterns exists for this student which affect his/her classroom performance? Mark all that apply.
    - No problem exists
    - Bilingual
    - Aural perception
    - Use of nonstandard English
    - Lack of verbal communication
    - Use of dialect

18. Considering all you know, to what degree does this student's background experience enable him/her to function successfully in your classroom?
    ○ Low ○ Moderate ○ High

19. How many days was the student absent for any reason during the 1978-79 school year? If possible, please refer to the attendance cards in answering this question.

First Semester → ← Second Semester

20. Which, and to what degree, of the following characteristics do you perceive as the student's positive strengths?

Self-concept (Low 1 2 3 4 5 High)
- High: Seems happy and appears to feel important to self and others.
- Low: Seems unhappy and feels unimportant to self and others.

Attitude Toward School (Low 1 2 3 4 5 High)
- High: Enjoys school and school-related activities.
- Low: Seems unhappy in school, does not enjoy school activities.

Social Skills (Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High)
- High: Appears to be independent, persistent, considerate of other people in social situations.
- Low: Appears uncertain in social situations, is confused about relating to others.

Self-confidence (Low 1 2 3 4 5 High)
- High: Appears to be comfortable with self, confident regarding ability to handle new experiences and to perform assigned tasks.
- Low: Appears to be anxious and unsure, particularly when confronted with new or demanding experiences.

Peer Relationships (Low 1 2 3 4 5 High)
- High: Enjoys being with other children and relates to them easily.
- Low: Seems to feel other children are unfriendly and does not have many friends.